



IDAHO WATER RESOURCE BOARD

MINUTES OF STATE WATER PLAN SUB-COMMITTEE MEETING

C. L. "Butch" Otter
Governor

Jerry R. Rigby
Chairman
Rexburg
At Large

Terry T. Uhling
Vice Chairman
Boise
District 2

Bob Graham
Secretary
Bonners Ferry
At Large

**Charles "Chuck"
Cuddy**
Orofino
District 1

Leonard Beck
Burley
District 3

L. Claude Storer
Idaho Falls
District 4

**Gary M.
Chamberlain**
Challis
At Large

**Lawrence "Vic"
Armacost**
New Meadows
At Large

Idaho Department of Water Resources
Idaho Water Center, Boise, Idaho
October 9, 2007

The Chairman of the committee, Gary Chamberlain, called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m. Board members present were Vic Armacost and Leonard Beck.

Staff members present were Hal Anderson, Administrator of Planning and Technical Division; Brian Patton, Bureau Chief of Planning Section; Helen Harrington, Planning Section Manager; and Sandra Thiel, Planner.

Guests in attendance were:

Peter Anderson, Trout Unlimited Jon Boling, Idaho Power Co
David Blew, Idaho Power Co. Kevin Lewis, Idaho Rivers United
Lynn Tominaga, Idaho Ground Water Users

Chairman Chamberlain turned the meeting over to Helen Harrington.

Agenda Item No. 1, Previous Revision Efforts

Ms. Harrington introduced documents. Mr. Anderson stated that in the past revision efforts were lead by Bill Graham and consisted of updating policies that were in place. Chairman Chamberlain asked the staff how they felt about changing policies. Mr. Anderson replied that other issues needed considering such as operating environment, goals, and organization of the plan, methodology, and time frame. Everything was open for discussion.

Agenda Item No. 2 Review of Other State Water Plans

Ms. Harrington had previously supplied other state water plans to committee members. There was discussion about those plans. Mr. Armacost liked the Utah plan. Some states include implementation plans; however, Idaho does not. Mr. Armacost noted that Arizona's executive summary included evaluations of other states' plans. Mr. Beck stated that Utah's plan focused primarily on conservation and he did not think that should be Idaho's sole focus. Mr. Patton

noted that Utah's plan included Bear Lake projects and a Lake Powell Pipeline and that these projects were funded by a sales tax. Some states do regional planning with separate local groups.

Agenda Item No. 3, Approaches for Revision Effort

Ms. Harrington asked the committee members what things should be considered for the revision. She mentioned topics for a road map to include the process, purpose and intent, organization and structure. She also asked how many years out the plan should go and what needs it should envision for the future. Mr. Patton suggested 20 years maximum. Mr. Anderson said 15 years for large projects. Mr. Anderson noted that the State Water Plan originally addressed unallocated water to prevent California from stealing our water. The plan focused on unappropriated water, but now major basins are essentially fully allocated. He suggested that future focus might be on redistribution as growth continues. This should be a recommendation since the Board needs to make that decision because it would be a legislative change not a constitutional one.

Mr. Armacost added that the plan needs a rental transition from agricultural to urban. There was discussion about how to address the issue of focus from unappropriated water in the old plan. Staff have discussed this with the legal staff and the Board can make the decision with legislative approval. Mr. Chamberlain stated he would bring the question to the Board.

Mr. Anderson noted that the Interim Legislative Committee is meeting October 23 to discuss long-term aquifer management. There was discussion about whether it was premature to bring this before the legislative committee at this time. Further discussion followed about changing the wording from unappropriated water to redistribution. Mr. Chamberlain asked if the Legislature would support the words "unappropriated water" being removed from the plan. Mr. Anderson stated he would discuss that with the Chairman of the Board.

Ms. Harrington discussed the structure of the plan. She noted that 1982 and 1986 State Water Plans were just policies. The 1996 version had both policies and resource inventory and summary. She asked if these should be separate documents. There was discussion about the structure of the plan. Mr. Anderson noted that the resource volume would become outdated quickly. Updates could be made; however, any changes have to be approved by the Legislature.

Ms. Harrington proposed new group headings that had been suggested in the previous revision: River Basins, Development, Management, Conservation and Optimum Use. She asked if that met the needs of the State Water Plan. Mr. Armacost suggested that major activities should be included for instance, the Nez Perce Settlement Agreement or the Bell Rapids Water Right Purchase. Mr. Anderson suggested a narrative, resource inventory, policy and expanded discussion. He wanted policy separate from recommendations. Mr. Armacost wanted a section with recommendations. He stated that policy should be stated first since it drives the recommendations. Mr. Patton thought that a page with recommendations would be useful for the Governor and the Legislature. Mr. Anderson stated that recommendations were usually embedded in the narrative. Mr. Armacost suggested that a cost estimate might be included.

Mr. Anderson suggested that other issues like conjunctive management, climate change and Federal requirements such as the Clean Water Act might be included. Mr. Armacost stated that demand estimates for water should be forecasted for twenty years and there should be enough demand to raise the price of water to warrant the price of storage. Mr. Chamberlain noted that it would take 20 years to rebuild Teton Dam. Mr. Patton added that California is spending \$7 billion on new storage.

Mr. Armacost thought Federal projects were problematic. Mr. Anderson said there would be more interstate agreements and water marketing in the future. Mr. Chamberlain suggested broadening the rental pools. However, Mr. Beck thought that at the local level rental pools are mostly imaginary. Mr. Anderson noted that the University of Idaho has been researching the concept of ground water banking.

There was discussion about the issue of climate change. Mr. Anderson would like to see additional policies on this issue to offset water supply problems. There was discussion about the effects of climate change. Mr. Patton stated there would be longer, drier dry cycles and wetter wet cycles and the state does not have enough storage capacity for either.

At this time the committee had a short lunch break.

Agenda Item No. 3, Approaches for Revision Effort cont.

Ms. Harrington summarized that there are 57 policies and five different groups. Ms. Harrington discussed ways and means of getting the information to the sub-committee members. Mr. Anderson stated that in the past, policies were drafted one section at a time and the final draft was submitted for public review.

Mr. Anderson stated it would take considerable time and involve public participation to finish the plan. He estimated the Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer Comprehensive Management Plan would be finalized by the 2009 legislative session. There was discussion about approaches and how much feedback was wanted. An initial draft could be sent out for public comment. A suggestion was made to have a stakeholder group or advisory committee consisting of irrigation, residential, commercial and environmental to assist in the plan development. Ms. Harrington suggested a target letter to interested parties to solicit comments perhaps through a website. She thought it would be easier to get comments on specific sections than the whole document.

Agenda Item No. 4, Long Range Schedule

The committee decided that some work from the ESPA CAMP process would likely be incorporated into the final State Water Plan; the completion date should be after the completion of the CAMP process. Mr. Anderson noted that the Board would need to be more involved in the last 6-8 months of the ESPA CAMP process.

Agenda Item No.5, Assignments/Actions

A decision was made for staff to issue a press release asking for specific suggestions and prepare a letter for targeted groups. Staff will draft a news release and letter for the committee to review at the next meeting. Staff will complete changes to the resource part simultaneously with the committee work on the policies. A legal determination will be made about Board authority to make changes. The committee will be prepared to review and discuss the policies in the Optimal Use and Conservation Groups at the next meeting. Mr. Armacost asked that a revision date be put on each version of the revisions.

Agenda Item No. 6, Next Meeting

Mr. Chamberlain suggested another meeting after the board meeting November 28. A decision was made to meet November 7th.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 2007.

Sandra Thiel and Patsy McGourty,
Secretaries